

**Nationwide Automatic Identification System  
Increment 2, Phase 1  
Friday, February 22, 2008  
Batch No. 4**

**Tracking ID:** 9

**Subject:** Performance Specification Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/10/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 - PSPEC **Specific Paragraph:** 3.6.1.0-1 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** PSPEC requirement 3.6.1.0-1 states "All HSI functionality shall be browser compatible. In the SOC Management brief at the site visit an Increment 1 web-based ASM-like capability was shown. It appeared as though the application was hosted at the data center with the application accessed via a browser. We believe that it was stated that the reason for this architecture was to support SOC COOP from other locations. The brief also stated that there was room at the SOC for two racks of equipment, and it is assumed that this is to host the LSS to be delivered as part of the core system. Furthermore, it was stated that C2Cen would provide for SOC COOP, and LSS will also be delivered to C2Cen as part of the core system. We have a concern with regard to the potential performance of a web-based ASM HMI/GIS given the potential message loading and graphic intensive nature of many ASM capabilities. Given that C2Cen will serve as the SOC COOP capability, and both the SOC and C2CEN will have an LSS that could also be capable of hosting the ASM services and HMI, is it required that the SOC ASM HMI/GIS be web based?

**Response:** The PSPEC does not require "web based" applications. However, the HMI (HSI) must be browser compatible. The application software can run locally or at the EDC.

**Tracking ID:** 29

**Subject:** Site Equipment for Post-IOC Sectors

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/14/2008

**Section:** Section B - Supplies or Services and Prices

**Specific Paragraph:**

B.1.1.2

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Including the variable shipping cost as part of the FFP CLIN complicates the bidding and evaluation of NAIS equipment and does not recognize that shipping costs could experience large changes through the contract performance. We request that the government modify these CLINs to allow shipping as a separate, cost reimbursable subCLIN with the equipment procurement, configuration and test as FFP. This could reduce cost to the government by eliminating the risk dollars that offerors may include in their fixed price.

**Response:** Shipping costs associated with CLINs 0010, 1010, 2010, 3010, 4010, 5010 and 6010 are hereby changed from "firm fixed price" to "cost-reimbursable".

**Tracking ID:** 32

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/14/2008

**Section:** Section B - Supplies or Services and Prices

**Specific Paragraph:**

B.1.1.2

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Presence of only one subCLIN for PSS equipment to be located at sites located with existing USCG equipment assumes only one configuration will be necessary. Diverse equipment may be required to meet system-level availability requirements. Similar comment applies to equipment for equipment for PSSs at leased or new build sites not located with existing USCG equipment. Consider modifying subCLINs to allow 3 subCLINs for R21 sites and 3 subCLINs for non-R21 sites. Government retains the right to order more or less than the stated quantities through other contract provisions. This could reduce cost to the government by eliminating the risk dollars that offerors may include in their fixed price.

**Response:** The Government agrees that there will likely be some differences in the configuration of equipment within these two general site types. However, the standard suite of equipment for each of the two general site types is expected to be reasonably similar in configuration to allow the Offerors to develop a proposal for this equipment on a firm fixed priced basis.

---

**Tracking ID:** 40

**Subject:** Enterprise Services Performance Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/14/2008

**Comment Date:** 1/14/2008

**Specific Paragraph:** 3.2.6.0-1

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Please state (estimate) NAIS data retrieval rates in transactions per day and data volume size of request. This data is required to for system sizing.

**Response:** The PSPEC, Attachment J.2 is hereby modified to include the following:

“As per Table 3.2: *System Scalability Metrics* in section 3.2.6: *Scalability*, the system is expected to support 20 concurrent users (all types, see section 3.9.1: *General HSI Requirements*) at IOC, and 400 concurrent users of all types at FOC. Users of any type may, given the appropriate level of system access privileges, perform a database query on the system—this includes manual or pre-formed queries by users at SWIII and automated queries performed by external systems such as MISLE.

Although the frequency of NAIS database queries and the nature (i.e., size) of the query results will depend greatly on the operational conditions of the Coast Guard at any given time, the following use cases are given in order to provide a synopsis of the most commonly expected uses of system database query.

The system is expected to, at a minimum, meet the operational requirements as set forth in the following use cases within the performance constraints described in the PSPEC, Section 3.7.1: *General Data Storage Requirements*.

- a. As part of an incident investigation, a user at a Sector Command Center

- needs to know all of the vessels that traveled through a specific geographic area during a specific time period. Using the GIS functionality in the NAIS interface on the SWIII, the user bounds the geographic area, and uses that boundary in conjunction with the desired time period to query the database for the MMSI, vessel type, maximum speed, and size of all vessels that match the query parameters.
- b. A user at a Sector Command Center needs to see the vessel track for a vessel inbound for that SCC's area of responsibility. The user queries the database for all messages and associated metadata received from that vessel from the time the vessel debarked to the present time.
  - c. A user needs to know all of the messages that were sent to or received from a particular vessel during a specific period of time. The user queries the database with the MMSI of the vessel and the period of time. The system returns all messages intended specifically for and received from that vessel, and also associates the vessel's track (i.e., location) during that period of time and determines which general broadcast messages should have been received by that vessel given the vessel's characteristics.
  - d. A user at the System Operations Center wishes to know the reporting rate for all vessels within range of a specific Physical Shore Station over a period of time. The user queries the database with the PSS and period of time, and receives a response that shows the MMSI, vessel characteristics, and timestamp and message type for each message received by that PSS over the period of time.
  - e. The MISLE system needs access to general NAIS data, and so runs a periodic automated query to determine how many vessels of a specific type are within each SCC's area of responsibility. The NAIS system responds with the number of vessels that match the criteria of the query for each SCC.
  - f. As part of navigation planning for a specific waterway or port, a USCG user wants to use historical vessel movement data to evaluate options for reducing risk of collisions. Using the system, the analyst queries the database to collect and plot vessel position reports to do statistical analysis to identify risks or plan new traffic patterns."

---

**Tracking ID:** 43

**Subject:** Performance Specification Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/14/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 - PSPEC **Specific Paragraph:** 3.7.1.0-2 and -3 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Please state the size and frequency of data query request requirements.

**Response:** System sizing and scalability information is contained in PSPEC Table 3.2. No other information is currently available.

---

**Tracking ID:** 48

**Subject:** Performance Specification Requirements

**Question Number:** 0 **Comment Date:** 1/14/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 - PSPEC **Specific Paragraph:** 3.8.3.0-3 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Does an Interface Control Document (ICD) exist for these current interfaces for Increment 1 operations? Please add the ICDs to the Technical Library?

**Response:** An overall Increment 1 Interface Control Document (ICD) is currently under development and is expected to be available upon contract award. The OSC Critical Design Review document (in the Technical Library) provides the design of the SOC Monitoring Tools system interface and is contained in Enclosure 8 of the Technical Library.

---

**Tracking ID:** 49

**Subject:** Design Constraints

**Question Number:** 0 **Comment Date:** 1/14/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 - PSPEC **Specific Paragraph:** 3.9.2.0-2 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Please identify the legacy applications referenced by this requirement.

**Response:** The software applications to be part of the Standard Workstation III Version 6 Standard Image have been added as Enclosure 11 to the Technical Library, Attachment J.8.

---

**Tracking ID:** 55

**Subject:** Performance Specification Requirements

**Question Number:** 0 **Comment Date:** 1/14/2008

**Section:** Attachment 8 - TECH LIBRARY **Specific Paragraph:** R21 site surveys

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Did the government acquire the technical data rights to known R21 PSSs, such as site survey data? Please post this information in the Technical library.

**Response:** The government has provided all available relevant technical information for existing Rescue 21 sites located in the three USCG IOC Sectors to assist offerors in developing a response to the RFP (please see following table in reference to specific information requested). Additional R-21 site specific information and access to the appropriate facilities may be obtained during the NAIS survey, system design and development phases.

---

**Tracking ID:** 56

**Subject:** Performance Specification Requirements

**Question Number:** 0 **Comment Date:** 1/14/2008

**Section:** Attachment 1 - SOW **Specific Paragraph:** 3.1.1.7.1 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** At the Cape May site survey, government stated preferences for implementations of systems at OSC. Use of common blades, tape backup and SAN storage can assist the government in efficient EDC operations. However, the GFE costs for these required systems do not appear in the RFP and do not allow the offeror to confirm a bid to the USCG goals. These design constraints also do not appear in J.9 Encl. 1 - OSC. Additionally, the government does not state what the minimum reliability is for use of each of these systems to allow offeror to assure meeting the PSPEC system reliability. What costs exist for offerors to choose different levels of response for restoration (Gold, Silver, etc?)

**Response:**

**The Offeror shall include the cost/price of all equipment (hardware, software, etc.) associated with establishing the EDC and providing the data storage component to be located at the OSC.**

**The Government prefers the use of common blade servers for the reasons articulated in the site visit meeting of Jan 8, 2008; The OSC offers two hosting service options: conventional server support or Enterprise Computing Service Blades. New systems that are brought into the OSC should employ solutions to reduce the data floor footprint, power requirements, maintenance, and, improve the ease of upgrades. A business case identifying the reasons that conventional servers are to be used instead of blade servers (e.g., there may be certain functions that the blades can not provide) must be provided to the Government. Additional information is available in the Technical Library.**

**The cost of services provided by OSC should not be included in the Offeror's proposal, as those costs will be borne by the Government.**

**Tracking ID:** 58

**Subject:** Design Constraints

**Question Number:** 0 **Comment Date:** 1/14/2008

**Section:** Attachment 9 - DESIGN CONSTRAINTS **Specific Paragraph:** J.9 Encl. 1 – OSC, EDC Constraints **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** What is the available bandwidth, interface and maximum and average latency between the OSC and Stennis EDCs for GFE WAN communications?

**Response: This information is not currently available.**

**Tracking ID:** 61

**Subject:** Technical Design

**Question Number:** 0 **Comment Date:** 1/14/2008

**Section:** Attachment 9 - DESIGN CONSTRAINTS **Specific Paragraph:** r21sites.zip, r21 site locations **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** The R21sites data base file provides R21 site information; however, the column headers are not readily understood. Examples are: Columns "HEIGHT\_OF" through "VHF\_RECE\_1". Please provide correlation of titles with Receive Antenna Height and Transmit Antenna Height.

**ORIGINAL RESPONSE:** Attachment J.9 has been revised to address the issue noted and will be provided as an Amendment to the RFP.

**UPDATED RESPONSE:** The R21 site data base file originally provided in Attachment J.9 is deleted. The R21 site data information is added to Enclosure 1 to Attachment J.8.

**Tracking ID:** 65

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0 **Comment Date:** 1/15/2008

**Section:** Attachment 16 – 4300A ATTCH-J **Specific Paragraph:** H.6.4 and Attachment J.16 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Section H.6.4 states that if the Contractor elects to employ foreign nationals in the performance of this contract, an exception to DHS' policy that only U.S. Citizens are allowed access to DHS systems and networks processing sensitive information must be obtained. The Contractor shall complete and submit Attachment J to the DHS 4300A Sensitive Systems Handbook (see Attachment J.16) identifying any foreign nationals that are expected to be part of the Contractor's team. Please clarify the information on the form that is required by the contractor. 1) When the non-US citizen is a subcontractor, is the first block to be filled in by the prime or subcontractor? 2) Please define Foreign Service National. 3) Please define Component Head.

**Response:** The first block of the form is to be filled in by the Prime Contractor. Foreign Service National is a contractor working abroad on behalf of a Federal Government Agency. Component Head will be the Contracting Officer or Contracting Officer Technical Representative for the Nationwide Automatic Identification System Increment 2/Phase 1 Contract.

**Tracking ID:** 75

**Subject:** Concept of Operations

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/15/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 – PSPEC

**Specific Paragraph:** 1.1.3

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Figure 1.1 shows two external connections. (12) External Service and Data Consumers, and (13) External Data Providers. For the purpose of sizing and dimensioning the system, what is the expected/maximum data rate or message rate for interaction with these two groups?

**Response:** For input from external providers-the system size shall assume an input of data from a minimum of 5 sources, each using 20 PSSs, at 100% VDL loading.

For output to external users, sizing should assume what is reflected in Table 3.2, the system is sending to those external users all messages that are being received from 400 PSSs, each at 100% VDL loading.

**Tracking ID:** 76

**Subject:** Technical Design

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/15/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 – PSPEC

**Specific Paragraph:** 3.8.2.0-2

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** What interfaces with NWS should be supported?

**Response:** The following two interfaces are currently used by the National Weather Service:

NDFD (National Digital Forecast Database); and PUFFF (PORTS (Physical Oceanographic Real-Time System) Uniform Flat File Format). The system shall be able to obtain and process a continuous weather data feed from the National Weather Service in XML format.

**Tracking ID:** 82

**Subject:** Performance Specification Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/15/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 – PSPEC

**Specific Paragraph:** 3.8.2.0-2,3

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Is the intent of these 2 requirements to listen to an RSS (Really Simple Syndication) or external data feed from the NWS and update the periodically broadcasting AIS message with weather data?

**Response:** Yes, the intent of these 2 requirements is to listen to an external data feed, which could be an RSS, from the NWS and update the periodically broadcasting AIS message with weather data.



**Tracking ID:** 100

**Subject:** Logistics Planning and Design

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/15/2008

**Section:** Attachment 1 – SOW **Specific Paragraph:** 3.1.1.3.7.2 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Has the USCG categorized the system in accordance with FIPS 199 and NIST SP 800-53? Is there a specific level expected?

**Response:** To date, the USCG has not categorized the NAIS Increment 2 system. All C&A work to date has been focused on NAIS Increment-1. The expected security level for NAIS I-2 is “Medium.”

**Tracking ID:** 102

**Subject:** Logistics Planning and Design

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/15/2008

**Section:** Attachment 1 – SOW **Specific Paragraph:** 3.1.1.3.7.2.1 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Does the USCG have an existing infrastructure for deploying and monitoring host protection services such as virus detection, host-based firewall, host-based intrusion detection, etc, or is the contractor expected to provide this capability?

**Response:** The USCG utilizes McAfee’s ePolicy Orchestrator product for deploying and monitoring its network assets. This product is used to address USCG’s host-based security requirements by providing a single solution to monitor and manage anti-virus, host intrusion protection, internal firewall, patch management, asset management and rogue system detection. Support will be provided to the administrators to assist them in joining the USCG Microsoft Active Directory (AD) for Microsoft Windows based solutions. If required, this product will be made available to the contractors. Non-Active Directory solutions will be required to implement a Host Based Security System that provides the same capabilities as the ePolicy Orchestrator product and modules as well as conform to the government and USCG security standards and compliance mentioned in Attachment J.1 – SOW paragraph 3.1.1.3.7.2 and all sub-paragraphs.

---



**Tracking ID:** 110

**Subject:** Physical Shore Station Performance Requirements

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/16/2008

**Section:** Other

**Specific Paragraph:** Site Visit

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** 1. What is the capacity of the R21 Generator? 2. How long should the NAIS UPS be required to power the NAIS equipment in the event of a power failure? 3. How much power capacity and heating and air conditioning can the contractor assume will be provided at the OSC? (it is currently at 93% of full capacity) 4. When does the CG expect to take over monitoring of the IOC? 5. Will the OSC provide NAIS with data storage and backup? If so, is there a charge? 6. What is the availability of the OSC data storage equipment? 7. Do we understand correctly that the ESB will be provided to NAIS by the Government? 8. What are the permitting procedures and processes for acquiring USCG or Government sites? 9. Does the contractor do permitting for non-Government sites?

**Response:**

**1. The typical R21 backup generator for an RFF is: 30kW, 120/240V, Single phase 60Hz.**

**2. The Standard R21 RFF UPS(s): The Tripp Lite: SU20000RTXL2U can provide a minimum backup power of 5 minutes for the RFF equipment in the event of a failure of primary supply power. The 5 minute time provided for the primary power to return or give enough time for the standby generator to start, stabilize and cut over. The UPS can operate from a 20A circuit breaker. NAIS equipment should have a similar characteristic.**

**3. Offerors should assume that sufficient power, HVAC and floor space will be available at OSC. However, Offerors will need to provide the physical space, power and HVAC requirements of their proposed equipment to be placed at OSC.**

**4. The CG will take over monitoring of the IOC sites upon successful completion of the IOC System Acceptance Tests.**

**5. OSC will host the NAIS data storage equipment and will provide standard support services associated with a hosted system (e.g., data backup). The cost of these services is borne by the Government. The Offeror should provide a data storage solution that optimizes total life cycle cost.**

**6. The current NAIS Increment 1 data processing subsystem (DPSS) availability is 99.697%. The Offeror should provide the expected availability of the proposed solution.**

**7. Yes**

**8. The government will execute permits; however, the contractor is expected to identify required permits, ensure completion of permit requests, and coordinate and administer the permit application process. We anticipate that permits will be site specific, depending upon the conditions at each site.**

**9. Please see response provided to sub-comment 8 herein.**

**Tracking ID:** 111

**Subject:** Performance Specification Requirements

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/16/2008

**Section:** Section B – Supplies or Services and Prices  
Attachment B.1.2 and Perf Spec 3.2 Schedule

**Specific Paragraph:**  
**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Attachment B paragraph 1.2 says the total period of performance with all the options is 96 months (24 for the Core + 6 x 12 months for each option). Laying the program out serially, the entire program (Core + Options) lasts for 96 months (ending in September 2016, assuming a start date of October 2008). The Performance Spec paragraph 3.2 says that the FOC date is Q4 FY 2013 (June-August 2013). It seems like there is a 3-year discrepancy here. Please clarify.

**Response:** The FOC date provided in Paragraph 3.2 of the PSPEC is provided for the Offeror to establish the start date for system life-cycle, for system design purposes. The actual FOC date for NAIS may be different.

**Tracking ID:** 115

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/17/2008

**Section:** Attachment 25 – PEM      **Specific Paragraph:** PEM and Section B Price Table  
**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** What is the duration of the Base Contract Period?

**Response:** The Base Contract Period of Performance will be 24 months. For estimating purposes the Contract Award Date remains as – September 1, 2008 – and the Base Period End Date remains – August 31, 2010.

**Tracking ID:** 118

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/17/2008

**Section:** Attachment 1 – SOW  
SOW 3.1.1.2.10.3, J.6 WBS, Schedule B

**Specific Paragraph:**  
**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** The J.1 SOW paragraph 3.1.1.2.10.3 requires an Initiation Baseline Review (IBR) annually and within 90 days of subsequent major events. The J.6 WBS structure and Schedule B list IBRs as a CLIN 0001 Activity. CLIN 1001-6001 references do not require an IBR. The PEM only captures IBR cost in Tab I2PEM. Given there are 6 options, in which CLINS and PEM locations should IBR activities be bid?

**RESPONSE:** As provided in Section 3.1.1.2.10.3 of the SOW:  
“The Contractor shall conduct an initial IBR not later than 120 days after contract award and may be scheduled in conjunction with other required meetings. Subsequent IBRs shall be hosted at least annually and within 90 days of significant contractual events, such as the exercise of contract options or contract changes that significantly alter the rate of production and requests to change the current-period EVMS baseline. IBRs may be held in conjunction with other meetings.”

**Tracking ID:** 119

**Subject:** Cost Evaluation

**Question Number:** 0    **Comment Date:** 1/17/2008

**Section:** Attachment 25 – PEM

Worksheet I2PEM and Row 1562 and following

**Specific Paragraph:**

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** The PEM Base Period is shown from Sept 2008 to March 2010 which is only 19 months but Section F of the RFP shows for the Base Period of performance – 22 months (which the PEM would extend to 6/30/2010). Also B.1.1 indicates a 24 month Period of Performance. Can you indicate the correct/consistent timeline for the Base Period?

**Response:** See response provided to Tracking ID Number 115.

**Tracking ID:** 141

**Subject:** Physical Shore Station Performance Requirements

**Question Number:** 0    **Comment Date:** 1/17/2008

**Section:** Attachment 1 – SOW

SOW 3.1.3.3 and Spec 3.2.2 Facilities and 3.3 PSS Req.

**Specific Paragraph:**

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** In determining the site equipment to be provided under CLINS 1010, 2010, 3010, 4010, 5010, and 6010, we assume that the phrase “suite of NAIS equipment (hardware and software)” includes those items necessary to comply with PSPEC paragraph 3.3, with the added proviso that the “means to protect.... Against environmental influence and damage” required in IALA A-124 paragraph 6.6 (Reference PSPEC paragraph 3.3.2.0-1) will be appropriate packing and/or shipping cases, but not shelters (see Rationale below). The “suite of NAIS equipment” also excludes items required to comply with PSPEC paragraph 3.2.2. Rationale: Offeor’s Site Survey and Coverage Design tasks under Options 1 through 6 will identify the facility requirements (shelters, towers, UPS, monitoring systems, etc.) in detail. Until those surveys and analyses are performed, exact equipment requirements and quantities needed to comply with the facility specifications are unknown. The proposed costs for the Site Equipment CLINs cited above are all to be FFP; given the lack of knowledge on specific requirements, we have no way to formulate FFP pricing. RECOMMENDATION: Please confirm that our assumptions on the Site Equipment Acquisition, Configuration, Testing and Shipment CLINs 1010 through 6010 are correct

**Response:** Yes, these assumptions are correct. The site equipment to be provided under CLINS 1010, 2010, 3010, 4010, 5010 and 6010 are the “standard” suite of electronic, rack-mounted equipment that is expected to go in the PSSs or at the LSS locations and are generally not dependent on detailed site surveys to determine quantities and take-offs.

**Tracking ID:** 144

**Subject:** Performance Specification Requirements

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/18/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 – PSPEC

**Specific Paragraph:**

3.8.2.0-2, -3, -4, -5

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** For cost estimating purposes, will the Coast Guard make National Weather Service data feeds (NOAAPORT, NWSTG, Family of Services, etc.) available in the Enterprise Data Center/OSC or the NAVCEN? Will there be any costs to the contractor associated with these data feeds? What interface is supported?

**Response: Subscription costs (if any) will be born by the government. For interface information, please see tracking number 76.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 148

**Subject:** PSS and SCC Site Specific Design and Implementation

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/18/2008

**Section:** Section J – Attachments

**Specific Paragraph:** Section J.8      **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Please quantify the current number and location (including latitude and longitude) of the PSSs in each of the sectors included in the work scope for the option years. We anticipate that this will be in the form similar to the information provided for the base scope of the work sectors (e.g., Delaware Bay) in the RFP/Tech Library as “Enclosure 1 of NAIS 1-2 RFP Section J.8,” please provide the same data set for the additional CG sectors. RECOMMENDATION: USCG to post this information to Tech Library.

**Response: The most current and relevant R-21 site information is available in the updated attachment J.8 – Enclosure 1, which now includes both IOC and available FOC Sector information.**

**Tracking ID:** 150

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/18/2008

**Section:** Section L – Instructions

**Specific Paragraph:** L.2.3      **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Offeror requests that the USCG further define the degree of information requested to be provided with regards to the “fringe benefits” portion of the data requested in L.2.3. For example, is the USCG looking for specifics (ie medical, dental, vision, etc.) or is the USCG looking for a fringe rate? The fringe rate is what is usually provided when data about fringe benefits is requested. RECOMMENDATION – Request the USCG provide clarification on what is needed to support the disclosure of “fringe rate”.

**Response: Please see FAR 31.205-6(m) for description of fringe benefits.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 151

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0 **Comment Date:** 1/18/2008

**Section:** Section L – Instructions **Specific Paragraph:** L.2.3 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** L.2.3 states that the RFP is requesting salary information for each employee who will be working on the contract. Offeror requests clarification as to whether it is just the base pay or are they looking for other compensation such as bonus, overtime, spot awards, etc? Please clarify the definition of salary information that is being requested by this section? RECOMMENDATION – Offeror is recommending that USCG further clarify the definition and extent of salary information it is requesting for disclosure as part of the RFP.

**Response:** L.2.3. restates the FAR clause, FAR 52.222-46 which requires submission of a compensation plan for professional employees. The response to the requirement must support a finding that professional employees are properly and fairly compensated.

---

**Tracking ID:** 156

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0 **Comment Date:** 1/18/2008

**Section:** Section H – Special Requirements **Specific Paragraph:** H.3  
**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Offeror is concerned that the definition of “foreign national” in Section H.3 conflicts with the definition under applicable U.S. export law and regulations which generally defines a “Foreign National” as person who is not a U.S. citizen, not lawfully admitted for permanent legal residence in the United States (e.g., not a ‘green card’ holder) (15 C.F.R. § 734.2(b)(3)) . . . and who is not a protected individual under the Immigration and Naturalization Act (8 U.S.C. 1324b(a)(3)). This generally means that persons holding dual citizenships (i.e., U.S. and a foreign country), “green cards” are treated as U.S. persons or citizens for purposes of U.S. export law. RECOMMENDATION: Offeror recommends that removal of this conflict of definitions and ambiguity in Section H.3, be resolved by the USCG to consider that this Section be simplified by replacing “foreign national” with the term “non-U.S. citizen.”

**Response:** It is the responsibility of each offeror to determine for itself how U.S. laws and regulations governing licenses, exports, and status of non-U.S. citizens impacts its proposal or would impact its contract with the Coast Guard. U.S. laws and regulations may impact one offeror differently than it impacts another offeror, and so each offeror must carefully make that assessment. So as to avoid creating the impression that it has legal authority to rule upon or administer licensing, export or immigration laws and regulations, the Coast Guard has chosen to strike the term “foreign national” from H.3 of the solicitation and to substitute the phrase “non-U.S. citizen.” The term “foreign national” is hereby stricken from H.3 and the phrase “non-U.S. citizen” is substituted in its place.

---

**Tracking ID:** 157

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/18/2008

**Section:** Section H – Special Requirements

**Specific Paragraph:**

H.7.1

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** H.7.1 States that the contract required insurance shall be supplied “at contractor’s expense,” but this requirement contradicts the cost-reimbursable provisions of this contract including FAR 31.205-19 and FAR 52.227-8I, which make such insurance costs allowable and reimbursable.

**Response:** The phrase “at contractor’s expense” is deleted from H.7.

---

**Tracking ID:** 158

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/18/2008

**Section:** Section H – Special Requirements **Specific Paragraph:** H.10.2 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Offeror requests that the USCG consider the following edits to H.10.2 as follows: “In any event, the Contractor’s estimate of net increase/decrease in the contract price or net cost of change, and the bilateral modification of this contract making the equitable adjustment, shall [delete: be conclusively presumed] include an [add: initial estimated] amount or factor for any and all delays and disruptions that may result from incorporating in this contract the engineering change(s) whether initiated and proposed by the Contractor or by the Contracting Officer, priced out by the modification.” Offeror believes that these edits are necessary because it is unreasonable to “conclusively presume” or provide a fixed amount in a cost-reimbursable contract for undefined and unknown “delays and disruptions.” Our understanding is that this would conflict with the 52.243-2 (cost-reimbursement) changes and the saving provision in H.10.6. Additionally, this would also conflict with Section F.1.1—52.242-15 (stop-work order) and 52.242-17 (Government delays), such that the contractor is provided equitable adjustments for USCG caused performance stoppages or delays. Further Section I includes 52.236-2 (Differing site conditions) that provides for equitable adjustment for such unknown or unexpected “delays and disruptions” even in fixed price contracts. RECOMMENDATION: Offeror recommends that the edits as proposed herein be incorporated into H.10.2 “. . . the equitable adjustment, shall [delete: be conclusively presumed] include an [add: initial estimated] amount or factor for any and all delays and disruptions that may result from incorporating in this contract.

**Response:** The applicable sentence of Section H.10.2 is revised to read “In any event, the Contractor’s estimate of net increase or decrease in the contract price or net cost of change, and the bilateral modification of this contract making the equitable adjustment, shall include an amount or factor for any and all delays and disruptions that may result from incorporating in this contract the engineering change(s).” Section I, clauses FAR 52.243-1 and FAR 52.243-2 are revised to read “FAR 52.243-1, Alternate II” and “FAR 52.243-2, Alternate II.”

---



**Tracking ID:** 159

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/18/2008

**Section:** Section H – Special Requirements      **Specific Paragraph:** H.11

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Offeror believes that the last paragraph of H.11 conflicts with FAR 52.243-2 and -1, by precluding schedule adjustments. RECOMMENDATION: Offeror recommends that H.11 be revised as follows: “The fact that the Contractor has requested a replacement shall not [automatically] extend the required delivery time of any item. Upon acceptance of a replacement, the Government may, but is not required to, grant a day-for-day extension to the delivery schedule for the time the Government took to approve the replacement[, or to grant other equitable adjustments in schedule as provided in FAR 52.243-2 or 52.243-1]. No extension shall be granted in the case of unaccepted proposed replacements.”

**Response:** The applicable sentence of Section H.11 is revised to read “The fact that the Contractor has requested a replacement shall not automatically extend the required delivery time of any item.” Section I, clauses FAR 52.243-1 and FAR 52.243-2 are revised to read “FAR 52.243-1, Alternate II” and “FAR 52.243-2, Alternate II.”

---

**Tracking ID:** 161

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/18/2008

**Section:** Section H – Special Requirements      **Specific Paragraph:** H.12

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Offeror is requesting clarification on the USCG use of Standard Form 1411. We note that this form was deleted from use in federal procurements as part of the FAR Part 15 re-write (1997). RECOMMENDATION: Offeror requests that the USCG clarify the continued use of this form for this effort or advise if the SF 1411 will be replaced by another form as no other replacement form has been implemented by the Gov. at this time.

**Response:** The SF 1411 will be used for this effort.

**Tracking ID:** 162

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/18/2008

**Section:** Section H – Special Requirements      **Specific Paragraph:** H.15

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Offeror requests that USCG modify the from Section H.15 which states: “In that regard, unless expressly directed in writing by the Contracting Officer, the Contractor is free to adopt or reject any verbal recommendations or advice offered by the Government during the conduct of any of the required SETRs. The first sentence appears to contradict the direction “not to proceed without written direction and receipt of a contract modification” as it states free to adopt . . . This text as written places a risk onto the contractor for proceeding “freely” to implement verbal agreed upon changes.



RECOMMEDATION: To be consistent with USCG current RFP Terms and Conditions, Offeror recommends that the text be revised to reflect that “the Contractor is [not] free to adopt or reject any verbal recommendations or advice offered by the Government during the conduct of any of the required SETRs [without official written direction from the Contracting Officer.]

**Response: Section H.15 is deleted and is now labeled “Reserved”.**

**Tracking ID:** 163

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/18/2008

**Section:** Section H – Special Requirements

**Specific Paragraph:** H.15

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Offeror requests clarification on the language within this paragraph that states “. . . such written request shall be made not later than five (5) days after being directed in writing by the Contracting Officer to implement said change and the Contractor waives any and all entitlements to relief from the requirements of this clause by failing to make a timely written request to the Contracting Officer.” Offer is requesting a clarification to the deviation for the standard 30 days to assert a right to adjustment for a written change order. Under (Changes-Cost-reimbursement FAR 52.243-2I) The Contractor must assert its right to an adjustment under this clause within “30” days from the date of receipt of the written order. RECOMMENDATION: Offeror recommends that USCG consider using the FAR 52.243-2 I requirement of 30 days for notification as waiver of entitlement for equitable adjustment is a risk passed on to the Contractor not otherwise noted in FAR 52.243.

**Response: Section H.15 is deleted and is now labeled “Reserved”.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 166

**Subject:** Systems Engineering

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/21/2008

**Section:** Section E – Inspection and Acceptance

**Specific Paragraph:** E.4

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Recommend that the call out for Capability Maturity Model be updated to the current model and rating, titled “CMMI for Development, Level 3.” (Reference to this quality standard appears in SOW 3.1.1.4.10.1 and 3.1.1.8.1.3. as well as Section M, paragraph M.2.)

**Response: Section E.4 is changed to reference: “CMMI-DEV v1.2, Level 3”.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 167

**Subject:** Systems Engineering

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/21/2008

**Section:** Attachment 3 – CDRLs

J.3-CDRLS, J.1-SOW; CDRL 1.4.4, SOW 3.1.1.4.4.

**Specific Paragraph:**

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Requiring DOORS native file delivery for RTM and RVM does not allow use of contractor investment in other systems engineering tools. Will the government modify delivery format to allow delivery of a compatible DOORS import format? Government permits delivery of compatible file formats for IDPE GIS in paragraph 3.1.1.2.12.1.5.

**Response:** Telelogic DOORS is the official USCG standard platform for requirements management. The contractor will be responsible for ensuring the proper upload of the requirements baselines into the NAIS DOORS repository. The contractor may develop and manage requirement baselines using other tools, but reviews of these baselines will not be performed or approved by the government until the contractor certifies their proper installation in the NAIS DOORS repository. The Offeror must provide for one Government user of these applications (in addition to any needed by the Contractor).

**Tracking ID:** 168

**Subject:** Systems Engineering

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/21/2008

**Section:** Attachment 1 – SOW

**Specific Paragraph:** 3.1.1.4.7.1      **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Requiring System Architect™ native file delivery does not allow use of contractor investments in other qualified systems engineering tools. Will the government modify delivery format to allow delivery of a compatible import format, such as UML?

**Response:** Telelogic System Architect is the official USCG standard platform for enterprise and system architecture. The contractor will be responsible for ensuring the proper upload of all system models, design and “as-built” artifacts into the NAIS System Architect repository. The contractor may develop and manage models and other artifacts using other tools, but reviews of these models and artifacts will not be performed or approved by the government until the contractor certifies their proper installation in the NAIS System Architect repository. The Offeror must provide for one Government user of these applications (in addition to any needed by the Contractor).

**Tracking ID:** 170

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/21/2008

**Section:** Attachment 1 – SOW

**Specific Paragraph:** 3.1.1.4.9.6      **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Network Connectivity Agreements – Paragraph states that the contractor shall be responsible for “...operating... all NAIS LAN infrastructures.” Please confirm that: 1. Offeror operates NAIS PSS LAN infrastructures until turnover of PSS to government operations after system acceptance. 2. The government shall continue to operate LAN infrastructures at all other locations, such as SCCs, SOC's and EDCs.

**Response:** The contractor shall be responsible for designing, implementing, operating, managing, securing, and documenting all NAIS LAN infrastructure as well as other NAIS equipment at all NAIS installations including PSSs, SCCs, SOC's, and EDCs until final test and acceptance terms are satisfied as indicated in "Section E.3 – Testing and Acceptance of the NAIS" in the RFP.

---

**Tracking ID:** 173

**Subject:** Design Constraints

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/21/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 – PSPEC      **Specific Paragraph:** 3.2.5.0-2      **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Please provide the unclassified interface characteristics of the systems referenced by 3.2.5.0-2 or the PSPEC.

**Response:** Please see response to tracking Number 71.

---

**Tracking ID:** 174

**Subject:** Performance Specification Requirements

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/21/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 – PSPEC      **Specific Paragraph:** 3.8.2.0-19 b. **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Is NAIS is required to transmit messages to vessels in VTS areas?

**Response:** Yes.

---

**Tracking ID:** 175

**Subject:** Performance Specification Requirements

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/21/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 – PSPEC      **Specific Paragraph:** 3.8.2.0-19 b. **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** What is the VTS interface for accepting transmit messages from NAIS?

**Response:** This interface has not yet been developed.

---

**Tracking ID:** 177

**Subject:** Performance Specification Requirements

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/21/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 – PSPEC      **Specific Paragraph:** 3.4.1.0-5      **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Is approved position correction information available from the CGDN+ services?

**Response:** There are no Differential GPS (DGPS) corrections available on CGDN+.

**Tracking ID:** 178

**Subject:** PSS and SCC Site Specific Design and Implementation

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/21/2008

**Section:** Attachment 9 – DESIGN CONSTRAINTS      **Specific Paragraph:** Encl\_5-SCC Constraints and Conditions      **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** The constraint states “All NAIS end-user functions must present themselves to the user from within the SCC C2 system, and will not require a separate user interface or stand-alone platform.” Please provide the definition of the SCC C2 systems’ interfaces that support web-browsable HIS.

**Response: All HIS functionality will be accessed from Standard Workstation III. See response provided for Tracking ID Number 9.**

**Tracking ID:** 180

**Subject:** Performance Specification Requirements

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/21/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 – PSPEC      **Specific Paragraph:** 3.3 also 3.8.2.0-12

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** With regard to receiving messages from SAR aircraft, what are the characteristics of the SAR aircraft radio emissions and flight parameters?

**Response: Aircraft AIS transponders will comply with current AIS standards. Table 3.3 of the PSPEC provides the threshold coverage requirements and PSPEC Section 3.3.4 provides the conditions for verifying AIS coverage.**

**Tracking ID:** 182

**Subject:** Performance Specification Requirements

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/21/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 – PSPEC      **Specific Paragraph:** 3.9.3.0-1 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Are the GIS layers and HIS in the SCC required to support navigation quality displays and calculations to be available in a web browser?

**Response: All GIS layers displayed through the his are required to be browser compatible.**

**Tracking ID:** 183

**Subject:** Design Constraints

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/21/2008

**Section:** Attachment 9 – DESIGN CONSTRAINTS

**Paragraph:** Encl\_1-OSC\_EDC\_Design\_Constraints.pdf General      **Specific Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Can the USCG provide enterprise licenses for the enterprise GIS capability ESRI product ArcServer?

**Response: Yes. Licenses can be provided after contract award.**

**Tracking ID:** 184

**Subject:** Design Constraints

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/21/2008

**Section:** Attachment 9 – DESIGN CONSTRAINTS

**Specific**

**Paragraph:** Encl\_1-OSC\_EDC\_Design\_Constraints.pdf General

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Please confirm that the offeror is not required to bid equipment for the Stennis EDC DR/COOP per the OSC Design constraints document.

**Response: Correct. The offeror is not required to bid equipment for the Stennis EDC DR/COOP. However, the Offeror is required to provide the design of the EDC DR.**

**Tracking ID:** 186

**Subject:** Logistics Planning and Design

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/21/2008

**Section:** Attachment 1 – SOW

**Specific Paragraph:** 3.1.1.5.2.11

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** This paragraph has seven subparagraphs. The last subparagraph, 3.1.1.5.2.11.7, Maintenance Transition Plan, and its associated CDRL do not appear to belong under the heading “Warranty Administration Program.” Please clarify.

**Response: The Maintenance Transition plan does not belong under the Warranty Administration Program. Its paragraph number is changed from 3.1.1.5.2.11.7 to 3.1.1.5.2.12.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 187

**Subject:** Logistics Planning and Design

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/21/2008

**Section:** Attachment 1 - SOW

**Specific Paragraph:** 3.1.1.5.6.2 Paras a. and b.

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Support Equipment Selection Criteria – We have been unable to identify the existence of any specific list of “Standard/Preferred USCG” or “Standard/Preferred DoD” support equipment items as identified in Paras a. and b. Please clarify.

**Response: The Coast Guard uses NAVSEA's Test Measurement and Diagnostic Equipment Index (TMDE) as its list of standard/preferred support equipment. The TMDE will be added to the tech library. Note: this database is updated frequently and this will only be posted once with the current version.**

**Updated Response: The current NAVSEA TMDE is posted as Enclosure 10 to Attachment J.8.**

**Tracking ID:** 197

**Subject:** Design Constraints

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/22/2008

**Section:** Attachment 9 – DESIGN CONSTRAINTS

**Specific Paragraph:**

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Enclosure 1 OSC (Operations Systems Center) Design Constraints and Charts #85 through #88 in “NAIS Increment 2, Phase 1, Site Visit Meeting – 8 Jan 2008 on Technical Library.” Should the contractor include costs for managed services such as Enterprise Storage, backups, monitoring, and Enterprise Computing? If so, what is the price structure for OSC EOC managed services at all levels?

**Response:** No; all costs for EDC managed services will be borne by the Government.

---

**Tracking ID:** 203

**Subject:** Data Storage Performance Requirements

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/23/2008

**Section:** Attachment 1 – SOW

**Specific Paragraph:**

SOW 3.1.1.2.12 and 3.1.1.2.12.2.4.

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** SOW 3.1.1.2.12.2.4. This requirement states that the “Contractor shall provide a transition plan for the migration of the IPDE to Government owned and operated infrastructure.” The targeted Government owned and operated infrastructure is not defined. Without this information it is possible that the IPDE developed may not work on the Government infrastructure. Please clarify.

**Response:** It is the government’s intent to have each Offeror use its own data environment during development to meet IPDE requirements, with a plan to transition the data to the government infrastructure prior to the Coast Guard support date. At present, the government is in the process of migrating existing data into a SQL server environment hosted at Operations Systems Center Martinsburg. Any future development or government infrastructure will comply with the CG Technical Reference Model and the CG IT Product Inventory.

**Tracking ID:** 207

**Subject:** PSS and SCC Site Specific Design and Implementation

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/24/2008

**Section:** Attachment 25 - PEM

**Specific Paragraph:** Site Descriptions

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** In Sector Mobile Sector, the technical library indicates there are 7 Rescue 21 sites, however, the PEM quantities called out in the PEM model for Sector Mobile is 8 PSS types that are integrated with Rescue 21. Please clarify, and provide how to estimate using the PEM.

**Response:** The government-furnished site information in the technical library should be considered when preparing the estimate.

---

**Tracking ID:** 208

**Subject:** PSS and SCC Site Specific Design and Implementation

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/24/2008

**Section:** Attachment 25 – PEM

**Specific Paragraph:**

Site Descriptions

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** The PEM has identified 7 PSS site types. Can we get definitions on the 7 PSS Site types so we can accurately address the CG needs and expectations? For example, does an “existing” site have tower, shelter, and power available?

**Response:** The Government provided PEM was removed from the RFP under Amendment No. 5. The site type information that was provided in the PEM was to convey that the Government expects that there may be various types of sites are available to meet the NAIS coverage requirements. The government expects to encounter four general categories of site types. The first category is a Vessel Traffic Service (VTS) site where existing AIS equipment exists and is providing AIS receive and transmit coverage for the VTS area. The second category is an existing Rescue 21 site with typical conditions and capabilities as described in the technical library at Attachment J.8. The third category is an existing government or commercial tower site where the tower, shelter and basic utilities are available; however, no further assumptions are made regarding real property, data connectivity and site access. This category includes Increment 1 receive only sites. The fourth category is a completely new site with no existing capability. In this case, all site permitting, design and development is required.

**Tracking ID:** 209

**Subject:** PSS and SCC Site Specific Design and Implementation

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/24/2008

**Section:** Attachment 25 – PEM

**Specific Paragraph:** Site Descriptions

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Specifically can it be assumed an “existing site” (Type 3 and Type 4) will have enclosed structure, power, tower, and network connectivity? This is important to know to provide accuracy in the cost estimating of site costs.

**Response:** Please see response to Tracking ID Number 208.

**Tracking ID:** 210

**Subject:** PSS and SCC Site Specific Design and Implementation

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/24/2008

**Section:** Attachment 25 – PEM

**Specific Paragraph:** Site Descriptions

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Type 7 sites are called out as VTS. From other documentation provided there are at least 3 kinds of VTS sites (VTS site with AIS, VTS site without AIS, VTS site with Increment 1 added). Can you elaborate regarding the nature of, requirements for, and constraints with this site type?

**Response:** Please see response to Tracking ID Number 208.



**Tracking ID:** 216

**Subject:** Cost Evaluation

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/24/2008

**Section:** Section L - Instructions

**Specific Paragraph:** L.4.4

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** The Table L.4.4 indicates that the Price Volume Narration in Volume IV, Section 4, should be submitted in MS Word 2003. Can the Offeror submit the basis of estimate (BOE), described at Section L.9.5.3.5, in either MS Excel 2003 to facilitate input to the PEM or in PDF format?

**Response:** The Price Volume Narration may include a variety of attachments in different electronic file formats. Both Excel version 2003 and PDF file formats are acceptable file formats. Excel is appropriate if formulas are used.

**Tracking ID:** 218

**Subject:** Site Equipment for Post-IOC Sectors

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/25/2008

**Section:** Section B – Supplies or Services and Prices

**Specific Paragraph:** Section B

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Please confirm that the equipment referenced in Section B for the Firm-Fixed-Price CLINS (e.g., CLIN 0010AC) is limited to the rack mounted electronic equipment and does not include other ancillary equipment and material that may be installed at a PSS by the contractor (e.g., coax cable, or new shelter).

**Response:** Correct. Also, please see response to Tracking ID Number 141.

**Tracking ID:** 219

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/25/2008

**Section:** Section E – Inspection and Acceptance

**Specific Paragraph:** E.1

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Offeror has noted that RFP contains FAR 52.246-10 (Inspection of Facilities). It is our understanding that this FAR clause was deleted from the FAR on May 15, 2007. Please confirm whether the FAR 52.246-10 reference will be removed from the RFP as it is no longer applicable.

**Response:** The FAR Clause 52.246-10 is now “Reserved”.

**Tracking ID:** 220

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/26/2008

**Section:** Other

**Specific Paragraph:** Schedule B, Page B-49

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Reference Schedule B, Page B-49, CLIN 3029 reference to SOW Paragraph (3.1.3.20.1) appears to be incorrect. To make this CLIN consistent with other similar Schedule B entries, would the govt. consider deleting the text “(3.1.3.20.1)”?

**Response:** The statement of work reference for CLIN 3029 is hereby corrected to reference 3.1.3.22.

**Tracking ID:** 221

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/28/2008

**Section:** Section H – Special Requirements

**Specific Paragraph:** H.17

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Please confirm that the reference to “SOW Section 3.1.1.5.2.1.11.2” in Paragraph H.17 contains a typographical error and should refer to SOW Section 3.1.1.5.2.11.2, Warranty Administration Process.

**Response: Yes, the correct SOW reference in the fourth paragraph of Section H.17 is 3.1.1.5.2.11.2.**

**Tracking ID:** 222

**Subject:** Other

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/28/2008

**Section:** Section L – Instructions

**Specific Paragraph:** L.4.10

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Please confirm that when used on one face of the paper as directed for large tables, charts, graphs, diagrams and schematics, 11x17-inch foldout pages will be counted as a single page.

**Response: Yes. An 11x17 inch foldout page (when used on one face) will be counted as a single page.**

**Tracking ID:** 223

**Subject:** Testing and Evaluation

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/28/2008

**Section:** Section J – Attachments

**Specific Paragraph:**

3.1.1.9.1.1 & 3.1.2.1

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** For cost estimating and schedule development purposes, please confirm that the estimated time that the Government will require to complete and document OT&E is four (4) weeks. Paragraph 3.1.1.9.1.1 refers to six (6) weeks; paragraph 3.1.2.1 refers to four (4) weeks.

**Response: The Government expects that it will require approximately 4 weeks to complete and document OT&E, as stated in SOW: 3.1.2.1. The wording in SOW 3.1.1.9.1.1 is revised to read “four weeks”.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 224

**Subject:** Performance Specification Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/28/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 – PSPEC

**Specific Paragraph:** 3.9.3

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** To which user sets listed in PSPEC 3.9.1.0-4 do the requirements in PSPEC section 3.9.3 apply? For example, do generic users have these GIS functions (without the transmit authority)?

**Response: The requirements identified in PSPEC Section 3.9.3 apply to all user groups. However, the access or use of AIS functionality shall be controllable by the Government to allow authorized functionality at each user level.**

**Tracking ID:** 225

**Subject:** Other

**Question Number:** 0 **Comment Date:** 1/28/2008

**Section:** Attachment 1 – SOW **Specific Paragraph:** 3.1.2.2.5 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Please clarify what the offeror's responsibilities are with respect to maintenance, removal and/or disposal of USCG assets at I1 sites that are not used in I2 sector coverage.

**Response: SOW Section 3.1.1.3.8.2 requires the development of an I-1 to I-2 Operational Transition Plan, which is to address the transition from I-1 to I-2 equipment and operational capabilities at the SOC, EDC, SCCs, and field sites. The plan shall address the disposition of I-1 sites that are not used in I-2 sector coverage. However, the Offeror is not responsible for the maintenance, removal or disposal of those I-1 sites not used as part of the I-2 coverage solution.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 226

**Subject:** Performance Specification Requirements

**Question Number:** 0 **Comment Date:** 1/28/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 – PSPEC **Specific Paragraph:** 3.3.3 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Table 3.4 requires coverage in VTS Areas. Please confirm that the PSPEC requires redundant coverage in these areas, which may already contain AIS transceiver sites.

**Response: The PSPEC does not require redundant coverage in Vessel Traffic Service areas. The Government expects to leverage existing AIS transceiver sites in VTS areas to achieve NAIS coverage requirements to the greatest degree possible.**

**Tracking ID:** 227

**Subject:** Design Constraints

**Question Number:** 0 **Comment Date:** 1/28/2008

**Section:** Attachment 9 – DESIGN CONSTRAINTS

VTS-R21-NAIS-1\_Site\_Information.pdf

**Specific Paragraph:**

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Request clarification of R-21 antenna system characteristics. The solicitation package provides a list of antenna gains at various sites. Request information on equipment between the antenna connection point at the top of the tower through the output of the CIMS ICU where the NAIS system will be connected. What is the path loss or gain from the antenna connection point at the top of the tower and the CIMS ICU input and the path loss or gain from the CIMS ICU input to the CIMS ICU NAIS output?

**Response: All information intended for release with the RFP regarding Rescue-21 and Rescue-21 sites has been provided in the posted answers to questions or in the Technical Library, Attachment J.8**

**Tracking ID:** 228

**Subject:** Other

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/28/2008

**Section:** Section L – Instructions

**Specific Paragraph:**

L.8.3.5

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Would the Government consider using the CPARS system in place of the required questionnaire to alleviate administrative burden on reference agency?

**Response:** The USCG will be using the CPARS system and the questionnaire to evaluate past performance. Therefore, please encourage your Agency to complete the questionnaire.

---

**Tracking ID:** 229

**Subject:** Other

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/28/2008

**Section:** Other

**Specific Paragraph:**

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Will the Coast Guard consider using existing contractors / contract mechanisms to do the equipment installs for NAIS Increment 2 phase 1 or phase 2?

**Response:** The scope of work for the Increment 2, Phase I contract includes equipment installations for the core capability and the sites to achieve AIS coverage in the three Initial Operational Capability Sectors. Thus, it is expected that the Offeror will perform equipment installations for Increment 2 Phase I. The Coast Guard reserves the right to decide how we will contract for Phase II of Increment 2.

---

**Tracking ID:** 230

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/29/2008

**Section:** Section F – Deliveries or Performance  
F.7.1

**Specific Paragraph:** F.7 and

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Offeror requests deletion of F.7 and F.7.1 stating that “The Government reserves the right to delay work at any site for up to 30 days, at no additional cost.” This statement directly conflicts with the equitable adjustment provisions in this contract at F.1.1 and specifically FAR 52.242-15(b) (Stop Work) (basic and Alt.1) and 52.242-17 (Government Delay of Work) as incorporated in Section F.1.1. These FAR clauses fundamentally recognize that contractors should not be responsible financially or in performance schedule for delays or stop work orders caused or issued by the Government.

**Response:** Section F.7 is deleted and is now labeled “Reserved.”

---

**Tracking ID:** 231

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/29/2008

**Section:** Section H – Special Requirements

**Specific Paragraph:** H.7.1

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** H.7.1 states that the contract required insurance shall be supplied “at contractor’s expense,” but this requirement contradicts the cost-reimbursable provisions of this contract including FAR 31.205-19 and FAR 52.227-8I, which make such insurance costs allowable and reimbursable. To remove this inconsistency, please delete the phrase “at contractor expense” in H.7.1

**Response: Please see response to Tracking ID 157.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 232

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/29/2008

**Section:** Section H – Special Requirements

**Specific Paragraph:** H.10.2

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Does this phrase H.10.2 mean that an ECP requires Cost Savings in it? These words seem to be spurious and presumably requires a costs savings for each ECP –reality is that not all ECP results in Costs Savings. Request deletion of words “The Contractor’s “Estimated Cost/Savings under Contract” for each ECP.

**Response: The term “Cost/Savings” as used in the RFP should be read as “Cost or Savings”.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 233

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/29/2008

**Section:** Section H – Special Requirements

**Specific Paragraph:** H.11

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Delete the condition #3 (DELETE: “The replacement item(s) must be priced at equal or less than the item(s) replaced, including support and maintenance costs”); This condition is unrealistic as costs of equipment fluctuate and new equipment/technology that may include improvements desired by the Government may cost more money in addition to the simple inflation or tax costs that may increase in the future years when Options may be exercised. Also, this is a cost-reimbursable contract that provides for reimbursement of equipment costs through changes (FAR 52.243-2, cost-re). Further, CLINs 0010, 2010, 3010, 4010, 5010 and 6010 provide fixed prices for equipment that could be “permanently out of production” when the CLINs are exercised and could cost more money that initially bid—the exchange of this equipment would be also be a change (52.243-1). It is also simply not reasonable to require the contractor to take all risk of price increases on a cost-reimbursable contract when the Government will be the direct beneficiary of any replaced equipment.

**Response: Condition #3 of Section H.11 is deleted and is now labeled “Reserved.”**

---

**Tracking ID:** 234

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/29/2008

**Section:** Section H – Special Requirements

**Specific Paragraph:** H.17

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Delete Section H.17 (Warranty Period) because it conflicts with the applicable FAR 52.246-3(f) and (g) (Inspection of supplies, Cost-Reimbursement) (See RFP, Section E.1), which provides that (i) the cost of replacement or correction is an allowable and reimbursable cost but no additional fee shall be paid, and (ii) contractor is given opportunity to correct defect before action by USG to correct or replace.

**Response:** The following two sentences are deleted from Section H.17:

**“When the correction or replacement requires transportation of the item or part, the Contractor shall bear all normal commercial costs for shipping to and from the point of correction or replacement. The Government will bear any extraordinary costs of shipping above the normal commercial cost.”**

**“If the Government does not require the Contractor to correct or replace defective or nonconforming supplies, the Contractor shall repay such portion of the Contract price of the item as is equitable given the circumstances after being notified within a reasonable time of the defect or nonconformance.”**

**Tracking ID:** 235

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/29/2008

**Section:** Section H – Special Requirements

**Specific Paragraph:** H.17

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Section H.17 deviates and conflicts with FAR 52.246-3(f) and (g) (Inspection of supplies, Cost-Reimbursement), which provides that the cost of replacement or correction is an allowable cost but no additional fee shall be paid, and contractor is given opportunity to correct defect before action by USG to correct or replace. In accordance with FAR 1.401 and 1.403, please provide the documented justification and authorization for this deviation from 52.246-3(f).

**Response:** Please see response provided to Tracking ID Number 234.

---

**Tracking ID:** 236

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/29/2008

**Section:** Section H – Special Requirements

**Specific Paragraph:** H.17

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** For Section H.17 (Warranty Period), we assume that in accordance with FAR 52.246-3(f), costs of correction or replacement of supplies will be reimbursable but no additional fee shall be paid. Is this a correct assumption?

**Response:** Please see response provided to Tracking ID Number 234.

**Tracking ID:** 237

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/30/2008

**Section:** Section J – Attachments

USCG Tracking ID number 12

**Specific Paragraph:**

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** On 28 January 2008, Government Tracking ID #12 to Question #31 states, “Will the USCG provide and updated PEM to cover FCCOM?” and Government Response states, “No, please refer to the response provided to Tracking ID number 139. Offeror can not find response to tracking ID number 139 on either of the responses provided on 22 January and 28 January. Please provide the response to tracking number ID 139 or clarify this response.

**Response: Tracking ID #12 was posted in error and has been removed.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 240

**Subject:** Performance Specification Requirements

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/30/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 – PSPEC

PSPEC 3.5.2.2.0-1

**Proprietary:** No

**Specific Paragraph:**

**Comment:** Is it the intent of the Government to use R21 DSC capabilities for the purposes of DSC VDL management? If so, what are the details of that interface or what is the contractor to assume regarding DSC transmit requirements for NAIS?

**Response: The government does not necessarily intend to use the Rescue-21 DSC channel for channel management, though an Offeror must comply with PSPEC 3.2.0.0-2: “The NAIS system shall not degrade the performance or operational availability of other USCG systems.”**

---

**Tracking ID:** 241

**Subject:** Logistics Planning and Design

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/30/2008

**Section:** Attachment 1 – SOW

SOW 3.1.1.5.2.10.2.2

**Proprietary:** No

**Specific Paragraph:**

**Comment:** The technical assistance phone requests shall be supported 24 hours a day, seven days a week.” Is this 24/7 phone support required to begin as soon as the Field Support Desk website is initiated?

**Response: The Field Support Desk, including technical assistance and website, would be part of Initial Support as required by SOW paragraph 3.1.1.5.1.7. This service is to commence upon the Government’s exercise of CLIN 0003.**

---



**Tracking ID:** 242

**Subject:** Design Constraints

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/30/2008

**Section:** Attachment 9 – DESIGN CONSTRAINTS

**Specific Paragraph:**

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** System hosting requirements by OSC are framed primarily by a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between NAIS and OSC. 1. Can the government provide an example MOA to better understand the level of detail and the type requests that can be made of the OSC to host the NAIS EDC HW and SW? 2. If the contractor specifies equipment or services, at the OSC (3 PAR storage or blade servers for example), how is the contractor to account for those costs in the NAIS proposal? 3. Who does the initial software hosting and how is this accomplished? 4. Can the MOA be used to specify Information Security and IP security and XML security devices or software?

**Response:**

1. No, the purpose of the MOA is used to define the roles and responsibilities between two parties such as the OSC and the Project Office and does not provide the detailed system hosting requirements.
2. The Offeror should include all hardware, software and services associated with implementation of the EDC as part of their proposal. The cost of the hosting services that are provided by OSC are borne by the Government and should not be included in the proposal.
3. The EDC will be hosted at OSC. The Contractor will provide the design to the Government; procure and install the hardware and software.
4. System design details will be captured in design documentation.

---

**Tracking ID:** 243

**Subject:** Testing and Evaluation

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/30/2008

**Section:** Attachment 1 – SOW

**Specific Paragraph:** SOW

3.1.1

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** QUESTION / ISSUE: SOW Section 3.1.1 defines the tasks for NAIS Core Capability. Sections 3.1.1.8.2.4 (IOC System Acceptance Test and Evaluation) and 3.1.1.9 (Contractor Support Services for Government-led Testing for IOC) address IOC capability which is for 3 IOC sectors. Is the IOC System Acceptance Test and the OtaandE Support on NAIS Core equipment (of SOW Section 3.1.1 and CLIN-0001) or is it on the IOC equipment that is delivered under 3.1.2 and CLIN-0002 option? RATIONALE: The SOW and WBS appear to require bidding costs associated with IOC in CLIN-0001 while all other IOC costs are in CLIN-0002. RECOMMENDATION: Clarify the intent of the Test and Eval defined in SOW sections 3.1.1.8.2.4 and 3.1.1.9.

**Response:** The Testing and Evaluation work described in SOW sections 3.1.1.8.2.4 and 3.1.1.9, though pertains to the Initial Operational Capability (as well as the NAIS Core Capability), should be priced/costed and delivered under CLIN 0001.

---

**Tracking ID:** 244

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/30/2008

**Section:** Section H – Special Requirements

**Specific Paragraph:** H.7.1

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Please delete 52.246-12 (Inspection of Construction). Per FAR 46.312, the clause 52.246-12 shall be inserted in “fixed price construction contracts,” and any such services under this NAIS contract are to be performed on a cost-reimbursable type basis. The RFP also already appropriately includes FAR 52.246-5 (Inspection of Services-cost reimbursable).

**Response: The FAR Clause 52.246-12 shall remain in the Request for Proposal.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 245

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/30/2008

**Section:** Section E – Inspection and Acceptance

**Specific Paragraph:** E.1

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Please delete 52.246-12 (Inspection of Construction). Per FAR 46.312, the clause 52.246-12 shall be inserted in “fixed price construction contracts,” and any such services under this NAIS contract are to be performed on a cost-reimbursable type basis. The RFP also already appropriately includes FAR 52.246-5 (Inspection of Services-cost reimbursable).

**Response: Please see response to Tracking ID Number 244.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 246

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/30/2008

**Section:** Section H – Special Requirements

**Specific Paragraph:** H.7.1

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Offereor is resubmitting this question as it corrects the FAR reference previously submitted. RFP states that the contract required insurance shall be supplied “at contractor’s expense,” but this requirement contradicts the cost-reimbursable provisions of this contract including FAR 31.205-19 and FAR 52.228-7I, which make such insurance costs allowable and reimbursable. To remove this inconsistency, please delete the phrase “at contractor expense” in H.7.1.

**Response: Please see the response to Tracking ID 157.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 247

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/30/2008

**Section:** Section I – Contract Clauses

**Specific Paragraph:** I.1

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** General Contract Requirements: Please insert FAR 52.228-7 (Insurance-Liability to Third Persons) into Section I. This is a standard cost-reimbursable FAR clause that should be included in this contract, which is for cost-reimbursable services. This NAIS procurement is not a fixed price services or fixed price construction contract (e.g., all the Section B CLINs are cost-reimbursable except for limited equipment CLINs that are Fixed Price). FAR 52.228-7 purposely limits certain liabilities to third parties not otherwise compensated by insurance. If this clause is not included in this contract, contractors will be required to purchase excess insurance more typical for fixed price contracts that will unnecessarily increase offered prices and performance costs. This is an important issue for all offerors that needs clarity for the cost proposal.

**Response:** FAR 52.228-7 is added to Section I of the RFP.

---

**Tracking ID:** 248

**Subject:** Other

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/30/2008

**Section:** Other

**Specific Paragraph:**

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** After a comprehensive consideration of the intricacies and many variables associated with the NAIS proposal, Offeror respectfully requests that bidders be allowed to provide Oral Presentations of their bids during the evaluation process. This will allow the USCG the opportunity to better understand the many trade decisions that were made in developing a best value solution for NAIS Increment 2, while maximizing use of existing Rescue-21 and Increment 1 assets. The page limitations for the proposal placed substantial constraints on the bidder's ability to provide much of the very important background information which underpins the proposed solution.

**Response:** Oral presentations are not to be included in the evaluation process.

---

**Tracking ID:** 249

**Subject:** Performance Specification Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/30/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 – PSPEC

**Specific Paragraph:**

PSPEC 3.3.3.0-3 and Attachment J5

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** The Performance Specification requirement 3.3.3.0-3 states [The system shall provide transmit and receive coverage in Inland Navigable Waterways as defined in Table 3.5. Graphical representations of the coverage requirements in Table 3.5 are provided in Attachment J-5.] Table 3.5 states for the Hampton Roads Sector the York, Rappahannock and the James Rivers all require coverage. Attachment J5 page 41 and 42 show the Inland Waterway Receive and Transmit Coverage Requirement Maps for Hampton Roads. The single map provided shows only the James River coverage requirements. In Attachment J5 the Rappahannock River is shown on page 21 in the Baltimore Sector. Please confirm that

the Rappahannock River is in the Hampton Roads Sector and not in the Baltimore Sector. Please confirm the Rappahannock map on page 21 shows the correct coverage requirement. Please confirm the York River is in the Hampton Roads Sector. Please provide a coverage map for the York River. In addition, please provide the ERSI shape files (\*.SHP) for the Inland Navigable Waterways.

**Response: The Rappahannock, York and James Rivers are all located in Sector Hampton Roads. The Rappahannock River map has been relocated and a York River map has been included for Sector Hampton Roads in an updated Attachment J.5. The shape files for the inland river coverage will be provided at contract award.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 250

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/30/2008

**Section:** Section B – Supplies or Services and Prices

**Specific Paragraph:**

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Section B: Construction services are not currently included in the scopes of work for the Option CLINs; rather the OPTION CLINs scopes of work are limited to preliminary RF design, site candidate identification and site surveys. We assume that contractors performing these Option CLINs under this NAIS, Increment 2, Phase I procurement, will still be permitted to bid and perform the actual construction services in any follow-on DHS procurement. RECOMMENDATION: If our assumption is not correct, please inform all offerors.

**Response: Contractors performing under the NAIS Increment 2, Phase I procurement will not be precluded from competing for the NAIS Increment 2, Phase 2 follow-on procurement based on their participation in Increment 2, Phase I.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 251

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/30/2008

**Section:** Section H – Special Requirements

**Specific Paragraph:** H.10

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Please delete Section H.10 as it confuses and degrades FAR 52.243-2 (Changes-Cost-Reimbursement) despite the savings clause provided at H.10.6. FAR 52.243-2(a), (b) and (d) provide the instruction necessary for processing cost-reimbursable changes.

**Response: Please see the response provided for Tracking ID Number 158.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 252

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/30/2008

**Section:** Section H – Special Requirements

**Specific Paragraph:**

H.10.2

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Please delete the following third paragraph of H.10.2: [Conditionally accept such offer by mailing or otherwise presenting to the Contractor a bilateral modification of this contract, for execution by the Contractor, except that it shall set forth the Contractor's estimate as a ceiling or a maximum change in contract price in the case of net increase and as a floor or a minimum change in the contract price in the case of a net decrease, and except that it may set forth the Contractor's proposed change in delivery schedule, if any, as a maximum extension or a minimum advance as the case may be; and the Contractor agrees to execute such a modification within fifteen (15) working days after receipt, and in the event of such a modification, the parties shall promptly negotiate in good faith to arrive at an adjustment within 180 days after the issuance of the modification or upon completion of forty percent (40%) of the work to be performed by the modification, whichever occurs earlier, in the contract price and the delivery schedule, if involved; or]. This deletion is appropriate because the discussion of minimum and maximum equitable adjustments in price and schedule is not appropriate for cost-reimbursable work and conflicts with 52.243-2; the above deleted language would essentially turn cost-reimbursable changes into fixed-price change orders within an cost-reimbursable CLINs. Further, as stated in 52.243-2(d) the disputes process is available per 52.233-1 if there is disagreement on an equitable adjustment in price or schedule due to a change.

**Response:** Please see the response provided for Tracking ID Number 158.

---

**Tracking ID:** 253

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/30/2008

**Section:** Section H – Special Requirements

**Specific Paragraph:** H.10

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Section H.10 is a deviation from applicable FAR 52.243-2 (Changes-Cost-Reimbursement). In accordance with FAR 1.401 and 1.403, please provide the documented justification and authorization for this deviation from so that offerors understand the objective of this clause which overall appears to conflict with the cost-reimbursable terms of this contract.

**Response:** Please see the response provided for Tracking ID Number 158.

---

**Tracking ID:** 254

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/30/2008

**Section:** Section H – Special Requirements

**Specific Paragraph:**

H.10.5

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Please delete the phrase [Pending such a modification]. We recommend the following edit to be consistent with FAR 52.243-2: [If directed in writing by the Contracting Officer to proceed per FAR 52.243(d),] the Contractor shall proceed diligently with contract performance without regard to the effect of any such proposed engineering change.} Please note that without these edits, the Government is instructing the contractor that it can proceed with unauthorized work but such work could later be unreimbursed without formal contract modification and notice to proceed.

**Response:** Please see response provided for Tracking ID Number 158.

---

**Tracking ID:** 257

**Subject:** Performance Specification Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/30/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 – PSPEC

**Specific Paragraph:** 3.1.5

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Does the DHS/USCG ESRI enterprise license include the license for the GIS data, or should that be provided by the contractor?

**Response:** The current GIS layers will be provided by the government after contract award.

---

**Tracking ID:** 258

**Subject:** Performance Specification Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/30/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 – PSPEC

**Specific Paragraph:** 3.1.5

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Will the USCG be providing the data storage capabilities for maps and GIS information, or should that storage be provided by the contractor?

**Response:** Contractor will need to provide space in the Integrated Product Data Environment (IPDE) for the GIS map layers required to support the queries and analysis outlined in section 3.1.1.2.12.2.3.9 of the SOW.

---

**Tracking ID:** 259

**Subject:** Performance Specification Requirements

**Question Number:** 0 **Comment Date:** 1/30/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 – PSPEC

**Specific Paragraph:**

3.3.2.0-4

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** There appears to be no standard metadata message available to monitor the transmit power level on a message by message basis from the base station. The base stations have internal test systems that will generate an alarms if the power level drops below the allowed level. Should the offeror propose to add a proprietary message and support in the base stations in order to monitor the power level of the base station on a message by message basis? If not, will requirement 3.3.2.0-4 be waived?

**Response: Paragraph 3.3.2.0-4 (d) refers to the power level control setting as defined in IEC-62320-1 annex A. This is required metadata.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 260

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0 **Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Section L – Instructions

**Specific Paragraph:**

L.4.4, L.4.7, and J.24 Reqt Matrix

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Section L.4.4, PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/NUMBER OF COPIES/PAGE LIMITS, Table 1, pg L-17 requires the Requirements Matrix (Completed Attachment J.24) to be part of Volume II – Technical Capability and Approach. From the NAIS web site, J.24 contains multiple requirements that will not be logically addressed by any subsection/part of Volume II (e.g., SOW Reference 3.1.1.2.4 – “The Contractor shall provide a Contractor’s Project Management Plan”); therefore, multiple entries within the Completed Attachment J.24 will cite/reference Supporting Proposal Sections external to Volume II. Contradiction exists between such “external” references and the instructions presented in L.4.7 CROSS REFERENCING, pg L-18. Please clarify.

**Response: Offerors shall submit a copy of the Requirements Matrix (completed Attachment J.24) as Section Four (4) of Volume III – Management Capability and Approach in addition to Volume II. The completed Requirements Matrix will not count against the total page limit for Volume II or Volume III.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 261

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0 **Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Section F – Deliveries or Performance

**Specific Paragraph:** F.7.1

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** F.7.1 – The government reserves the right to delay the work at any site for up to 30 days, at NO additional cost. This could have cost implications (crew demobilization – remobilization. Since the effort is cost plus, isn’t the cost due to the delay chargeable?

**Response: See response provided under Tracking ID Number 230.**

---



**Tracking ID:** 262

**Subject:** AIS Service Management Performance Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 – PSPEC

**Specific Paragraph:**

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Does the Government really want NAIS ASM services and data to be exposed externally via public services?

**Response:** AIS Service Management (ASM) services shall be discoverable via the ESB while adhering to access privilege restrictions outlined in PSPEC sections 3.2.5 and 3.5.3.

---

**Tracking ID:** 263

**Subject:** Physical Shore Station Performance Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 – PSPEC

**Specific Paragraph:**

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Does management data (e.g., PSS status like intrusion alarms, voltage for batteries) need to be exposed via open-standard / XML services for external consumption, or is it considered an internal data element to ASM? If so, this is not covered in the COI XML schema xsd's...is there a defined schema for this data?

**Response:** PSS system management data is for internal consumption by the ASM only. Guidance regarding use of open standards still applies.

---

**Tracking ID:** 264

**Subject:** Design Constraints

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Attachment 9 – DESIGN CONSTRAINTS

**Specific Paragraph:**

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** What are the details of the GFE ESB?

**Response:** See response to Tracking ID Number 83.

---

**Tracking ID:** 265

**Subject:** Design Constraints

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Attachment 9 – DESIGN CONSTRAINTS

**Specific Paragraph:**

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Will the ESB support the WS-Eventing spec for asynchronous web service comms?

**Response:** DHS and USCG SOA and ESB plans are still evolving. All information currently available has been provided in the NAIS PSPEC, Attachment J.2, Section 3.1.7, pp. 17 – 18.

**Tracking ID:** 266

**Subject:** Design Constraints

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Attachment 9 – DESIGN CONSTRAINTS

**Specific Paragraph:**

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Will USCG use the NCSE SOAF ESB (BEA's ALSB)?

**Response:** See response to Tracking ID Number 265.

---

**Tracking ID:** 267

**Subject:** Design Constraints

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Attachment 9 – DESIGN CONSTRAINTS

**Specific Paragraph:**

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** What is the DHS Enterprise Architecture?

**Response:** The "DHS Enterprise Architecture" defines the missions of the Department, the information and technologies needed by the Department to perform these missions, and the transformational processes for implementing new technologies in response to changing mission needs. See the NAIS PSPEC, Attachment J.2, Section 3.1.6, p. 17. The DHS Technical Reference Model (TRM) and the USCG IT Product Inventory (ITPI) are available in the NAIS Technical Library.

---

**Tracking ID:** 268

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Attachment 1 – SOW

**Specific Paragraph:**

3.1.1.2.10.1

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Paragraph 3.1.1.2.10.1 of the SOW states that "The EVMS requirements shall be extended to Contractor divisions and all major subcontractors (defined as those performing work associated with meeting this contract with value equal to or exceeding 10% of the Contractor's awarded contract value)". Paragraph 3.1.1.2.14.3, also states "major subcontractors (defined as those performing work associated with this contract with value equal to or exceeding 10% of the Contractor's awarded contract value). However, Paragraph L.9.1.5.3. (of Section L detailing the use of Other Than Certified Cost or Pricing Data states "Other than certified cost or pricing data is required from the Offeror and from each major subcontractor, interdivisional transfer, and vendor (hereinafter referred to as subcontractor(s)) regardless of tier, whose total price for all effort in response to this solicitation exceeds \$11.5 million dollars". Should Section L Paragraph L.9.1.5.3 read "10% of the Contractor's awarded contract value" as in the SOW?

**Response:** The requirement at L.9.1.5.3. establishes the threshold of \$11.5 million dollars and is stated correctly as it pertains to the submission of Other Than Certified Cost or Pricing Data. The SOW requirement sets the threshold for EVMS requirements which is different from the requirement to submit Other Than Cost or Pricing Data.

**Tracking ID:** 269

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Section K – Representations and Certifications

**Specific Paragraph:**

K.11

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Section K.11 states the NAICS Code for this acquisition is 517919 with the small business size standard being \$12.5 million. Per the SBA site, the size standard for NAICS Code 517919 is \$23M. Please clarify which standard shall apply to this acquisition.

**Response:** The small business size standard for 517919 was increased to \$23M on October 1, 2007. This change is hereby made to the RFP.

---

**Tracking ID:** 277

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Section L – Instructions

**Specific Paragraph:** L.3.8

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** If a contractor does not use E-verify but uses an equivalent model that performs the same functions, can the contractor still obtain a strength rating?

**Response:** Please see response provided to Tracking ID Number 153.

---

**Tracking ID:** 278

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Section L – Instructions

**Specific Paragraph:**

L.9.4.12

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Section L.9.4.12 indicates that the KO will provide a POC for the PEM, however, the answer to the question for Tracking ID 11 indicated that “telephonic conversations between offerors and the USCG PEM POC will not be conducted”. Please confirm how USCG plans to resolve PEM issues offerors may encounter in a timely manner.

**Response:** Please refer to Amendment No. 5 which removes the PEM in its entirety.

---

**Tracking ID:** 279

**Subject:** Performance Specification Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 – PSPEC

**Specific Paragraph:**

3.2.7.0-2

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** In a prior question response (Tracking ID 52), the government stated that offerors should consider the R21 site reliability to 99.5% for supporting NAIS. Even given perfect (=1.0) reliability of NAIS equipment for processing AIS messages and with the stated WAN reliability of 99.9%, the SCC reliability falls below 96% when 9 or more R21 PSS are used in a sector (without adding new sites with overlapping coverage). Use of at 9 or more R21 sites is expected in at least Sector New Orleans and other sectors. Given the current requirement statement and R21 reliability, this situation results from the

compounding R21 reliability factors when reliability is assessed at the sector level. (1) Can the government offer guidance with regard to use of the R21 reliability of 99.5%? (2) Does this figure refer to the whole R21 site or does it pertain to just the R21 RF equipment in use by NAIS?

**Response: The 99.5% availability figure applies to the entire R-21 site. Additional information for the components shared w/R21 is provided as follows:**

**The MTBF for the CIMS equipment is 134,000 hours. This includes all of the CIMS components.**

**The MTBF for the VHF RX and TX Antenna is estimated at 170,823 hours each.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 280

**Subject:** Logistics Planning and Design

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Attachment 3 – CDRLs      **Specific Paragraph:** 1.5.5.5, 1.5.7.2, 1.5.7.3

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Is there an expected final submission with post-OT&E and post-FOC updates?

**Response: CDRL 1.5.5.5, the IETM shall be maintained and updated as necessary post-IOC, upon the Government's exercise of the Initial Logistics Support option CLINs, as described by SOW Section 3.1.3.2.6 The Government does not expect a subsequent submission of CDRLs 1.5.7.2 nor 1.5.7.3 post-OT&E nor post-FOC.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 281

**Subject:** Logistics Planning and Design

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Attachment 1 – SOW      **Specific Paragraph:** 3.1.1.5.5.1      **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** MIL-DTL-24784B is superseded by Revision C. Should this be used for IETM standardization?

**Response: Yes, the MIL-DTL-24784C should be used in the development of the IETM. This reference hereby updated.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 282

**Subject:** Sector Survey and Coverage Design

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Attachment 8 – TECH LIBRARY      **Specific Paragraph:**

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Our review of the Existing Vessel Traffic Service (VTS), Rescue 21 (R21), & Nationwide Automatic Identification System (Nais) Increment I (I-1) Sites/Equipment Located in NAIS Initial Operational Capability (IOC) Sectors provided in SECTION J.8, Enclosure 1 (revised in Amendment 1) have shown there is considerable variance between listed site name, location and actual tower location. Some sites in question are: Salem,

Manasquan, Tuckerton, Berlin, Pungo Fields. The locations of R-21 towers is a critical factor in developing the most cost effective solution and creates a competitive disadvantage if inaccurate data is used in developing the RF analysis necessary for the proposal submission. One likely offeror would have access to the correct R-21 site locations. We request that the data be validated and a correct listing provided. Additionally, considering the time required to develop the analysis, we request an appropriate extension be issued concurrent with provision of the correct data.

**Response: Attachment J-8 Enclosure 1 is hereby updated.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 283

**Subject:** Performance Specification Requirements

**Question Number:** 0 **Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Attachment 1 – SOW

SOW 3.1.1.4.10.2.1, 3.2.6.0-1 – 3.2.6.0-3

**Specific Paragraph:**

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** These SOW paragraphs indicate that the contractor is supposed to provide EDC and EDC backup COTS licenses for a full nationwide implementation as part of the core delivery. Is full nationwide coverage to be interpreted as FOC? The PSPEC provides IOC and FOC thresholds and indicates that components are to scale. This would imply that the core or IOC processing, storage, and licensing be sized according to IOC threshold requirements and scaled in support of FOC deployment and to meet the FOC threshold requirements. These sections appear to require that all software licenses required to meet FOC requirements be delivered as part of the core delivery, but there does not appear to be any accommodations in the SOW or CDRL for later deliver of hardware or software to scale the EDC processing and storage capacities to meet FOC threshold requirements. Please clarify the requirements with regard to the requirements for delivery of hardware and software to meet core threshold requirements and the requirements for delivery of hardware and software that would be required scale the EDC to meet FOC threshold requirements. If the intent is delivery of a core EDC capability meeting IOC requirements and scaling to meet FOC requirements, please indicate what CLIN the hardware and software required to scale should be priced under.

**Response: Yes, full nationwide coverage should be interpreted as FOC. The Offeror is expected to propose a data storage solution for NAIS that meets the IOC system requirements and deliver a scalable design that the Government may use via other contract vehicles to meet the FOC requirements. The Offeror is not expected, nor required, to include costs for storage hardware and software beyond IOC. Any systems engineering work that is necessary to support the Government's progress to FOC, including the scaling of the components to meet FOC requirements, shall be priced under CLIN1001, 2001, 3001, 4001, 5001 and 6001 as appropriate. The Offeror shall not include the hardware for the backup EDC site, but shall provide the software necessary to implement the backup EDC site as part of core implementation per SOW Section 3.1.1.4.10.2.2.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 284

**Subject:** Performance Specification Requirements

**Question Number:** 0 **Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Attachment 1 – SOW

3.1.1.4.10.2.1, 3.2.6.0-1 – 3.2.6.0-3

**Specific Paragraph:**

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** There doesn't appear to be an SOW requirement or CDRL for delivery of the hardware or installation of a backup EDC. Is this a requirement? If so, under what CLIN should it be priced? Should the IOC or FOC threshold requirements be used for sizing the hardware and software required for the backup EDC? If IOC, what CLIN should be used to price the hardware and software required to scale?

**Response:** Please see response to tracking number 283.

---

**Tracking ID:** 285

**Subject:** Other

**Question Number:** 0 **Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Attachment 1 – SOW **Specific Paragraph:** 3.1.1.7.1.1 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Is the backup EDC to be a mirror of the primary EDC or storage capability only?

**Response:** The backup EDC site is not expected to mirror the primary EDC (i.e., not active-active). The backup site is intended for disaster recovery and continuity of operations (DR/COOP). However, the backup site is required to provide the same full functional and processing capabilities, throughput, and bandwidth of the primary EDC.

---

**Tracking ID:** 286

**Subject:** Core System Implementation

**Question Number:** 0 **Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Attachment 1 – SOW

**Specific Paragraph:**

3.1.1, 3.1.1.4.10.2.4, 3.1.1.4.10.2.5, 3.1.1.7.1.2, 3.1.1.7.1.5, 3.9.1.0-4 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** It appears as though the intent of the cited SOW paragraphs is to deliver to C2Cen SOC backup capability to C2Cen for operational use post IOC and an SCC capability for use in testing and support. Please clarify the capabilities and intended use (CONOPS) for the capabilities to be delivered to C2Cen as part of the core. Also, delivery of the core capability in terms of components and quantities does not allow optimization of equipment sizing, location, C2 integration, redundancy, and associated trade-off considerations. Please state the requirements for delivery of core capability to C2Cen in terms of capability versus components and quantities, and please broaden CLIN 1 to allow installation of additional components and quantities of components at C2Cen.

**Response:**

The capabilities are required as stated throughout section 3.1.1. The primary intended use at core delivery at C2CEN is testing and establishment of the SOC backup facility. In addition to the SOC backup, 2 fully functional PSSs are to be installed at C2CEN. Section 3.1.1. outlines all capabilities and quantities to be delivered to C2CEN to support the NAIS core capability. CLIN 1 will not be changed.

---

**Tracking ID:** 287

**Subject:** PSS and SCC Site Specific Design and Implementation

**Question Number:** 0 **Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Attachment 1 – SOW **Specific Paragraph:** 3.1.3.1.2 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** This section indicates that only those services defined in 3.1.1 will be required during FOC. Will the CG also require some of the services defined in 3.2.2 such as site design, tower design, etc.?

**Response:** No, these services will be provided under Phase II of I-2.

---

**Tracking ID:** 288

**Subject:** Core System Implementation

**Question Number:** 0 **Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 – PSPEC **Specific Paragraph:** 3.1.1 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** re the help desk and other tools referenced available for reuse? If so please identify and provide details.

**Response:** All software is available for reuse. Helpdesk functionality is provided by Remedy A.R.S. and the NAIS SOC monitoring tools are already listed in the technical library.

---

**Tracking ID:** 289

**Subject:** Performance Specification Requirements

**Question Number:** 0 **Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 – PSPEC **Specific Paragraph:** 3.2.1.0-4 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Should all services be exposed to be discovered by external system or just enterprise services? Please clarify which services need to be exposed.

**Response:** All Components identified in Figure 3.1 (PSPEC) shall be exposed and discoverable while adhering to system access privileges restrictions as per sections 3.2.5 and 3.5.3 of the PSPEC.

---

**Tracking ID:** 290

**Subject:** Physical Shore Station Performance Requirements

**Question Number:** 0 **Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 – PSPEC **Specific Paragraph:** Table 3-1 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** In investigating the use of common antennas with R21 it appears from the manufacturers specifications as though 2 of the 4 antennas used by Rescue 21 do not meet the survivable wind requirement. Is the stated wind requirement correct? If not, please provide the correct requirement? If so, is use of these antennas acceptable if they don't meet the requirement? If an NAIS contractor reuses R21 antennas are they responsible for replacing the antenna with one that meets the requirements?



**Response:** The stated requirement is correct. Rescue-21 antenna installations shall be considered as meeting NAIS survivability requirements. The contractor is not expected to replace any Rescue-21 antennas.

**Tracking ID:** 291

**Subject:** General System Performance Requirements

**Question Number:** 0 **Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 – PSPEC  
3-1

**Specific Paragraph:** Table

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Please clarify the requirement for equipment and/or shelters to survive when immersed in salt water. Please clarify or quantify shock.

**Response:** Refer to PSPEC paragraph 3.2.2.0-3. The survivability of equipment can be addressed using protective facilities.

---

**Tracking ID:** 292

**Subject:** AIS Service Management Performance Requirements

**Question Number:** 0 **Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 – PSPEC **Specific Paragraph:** 3.5.3.0-9 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Is this intended as component response times or service response times?

**Response:** This refers to Component as defined in PSPEC paragraph 3.2.1.0-2.

---

**Tracking ID:** 293

**Subject:** Design Constraints

**Question Number:** 0 **Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 – PSPEC  
3.2.1.0-3

**Specific Paragraph:**

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Do products and standards have to be listed in both the DHS TRM and the USCG ITPI before they can be proposed as part of an NAIS solution?

**Response:** No. There is currently no requirement for proposed products and standards to be listed in both the current DHS TRM and USCG ITPI. The requirement may be met if the items are currently listed in one or the other or both. However, any new technologies or new products under an existing technology will be required to meet the standard for “technology insertion” into the DHS TRM which is the current governing document. New products may be proposed but the Contractor must provide assistance to support the Government’s justification for technology insertion.

---

**Tracking ID:** 294

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Section L – Instructions

**Specific Paragraph:** Section

L.8.4.2

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Reference NAIS Solicitation, Section L.8.4.2 states the Subcontracting Plan shall include the Offerors plans to meet the following Government established goals which are based on the total direct costs associated for the entire effort proposed under this contract. Offer's experience on previous Government Solicitations, the Small Business Goals are applicable only to the Planned Subcontracting portion of the Total Contract price – FAR 19.704(a)(2). Please confirm whether the SBA 14% goal is against the direct total contract costs, or the direct Subcontracting costs.

**Response:** The subcontracting 14% goal is against the direct total costs. Of that 14% to be subcontracted, the offeror must identify the percentage of the 14% that will be subcontracted and to whom, for example, small business, veteran-owned, etc.

---

**Tracking ID:** 295

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Section F – Deliveries or Performance

**Specific Paragraph:** F.3.1

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** CLIN 0003: Initial Logistics Support Deliverables and Services. RFP states that delivery will be [Date of exercise of option through the end of base Period]. For purposes of costing, can Offeror assume that the option would be exercised upon completion of CDR. If not, then please provide other date in which this option could be exercised?

**Response:** For purposes of costing, the Offeror may assume that date of option CLIN 0003 exercise will occur upon implementation of the NAIS Core Capability.

---

**Tracking ID:** 296

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Section I – Contract Clauses

**Specific Paragraph:** I.6

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Please delete FAR 52.245-17 Special Tooling and FAR 52.245-18 Special Test Equipment as such clauses are no longer effective given the re-write of Government Property FAR 52.245-1 June 2007.

**Response:** FAR Clauses 52.245-17 and 52.245-18 are hereby deleted from the RFP.

---

**Tracking ID:** 297

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Section I – Contract Clauses

**Specific Paragraph:** I.8

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Section I.8 FAR 52.217-8 of the RFP was revised to allow the USCG to extend services not to exceed 24 months. However, FAR 52.217-8 Option to Extend Services states [The option provision may be exercised more than once, but the total extension of performance hereunder shall not exceed 6 months.] Please change the 24 months noted to 6 months in accordance with FAR 52.217-8 or clarify the deviation.

**Response:** The referenced FAR cite of 24 months is hereby changed to 6 months.

---

**Tracking ID:** 298

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0 **Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Other

**Specific Paragraph:** RFP Amendments 1, 2, and 3 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Based on responses received on 22 January and 28 January, Gov't was to provide updated RFP documents as noted in Amendments 1, 2, and 3. Current documents on website appear to show that one CDRL was updated in accordance with the Amendment 3 provided. Please provide a date when the updated RFP documents will be posted.

**Response:** All Attachment J documents referenced in issued Amendments have been amended, removed and/or replaced. A conforming copy of the RFP will be provided the week of February 25, 2008.

**Tracking ID:** 299

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Section I – Contract Clauses

**Specific Paragraph:** I.4

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** RFP incorporates FAR 52.227-22 which is not an appropriate clause since the prescription at 27.409(k) specifically excludes NASA and the Coast Guard from using this clause. Please delete this FAR Clause.

**Response:** FAR 52.227-22 shall remain in the RFP.

---

**Tracking ID:** 300

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Section I – Contract Clauses

**Specific Paragraph:** I.5

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** The RFP incorporates FAR 52.236-1. This clause states that Performance of Work by the Contractor: As prescribed in 36.501(b), insert the following clause: [Complete the clause by inserting the appropriate percentage consistent with the complexity and magnitude of the work and customary or necessary specialty subcontracting (see 36.501(a)).] RFP does not include a percentage of work reference. Is Offeror correct to assume that a mutual agreement as to percentage of work to be completed will be negotiated upon contract award?

**Response: FAR 52.236-1 is hereby deleted.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 301

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Section E – Inspection and Acceptance

**Specific Paragraph:** E.2

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** RFP incorporates FAR 52.246-10 INSPECTION OF FACILITIES APRIL 1984. This FAR Clause is currently [Reserved]. Offeror requests that FAR 52.246-10 be deleted from this section.

**Response: FAR Clause 52.246-10 is hereby deleted.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 302

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Section I – Contract Clauses

**Specific Paragraph:** I.11

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Offeror suggests correcting the effective date of the following RFP FAR clause to reflect (DEC 2007) as this is the current version. FAR 52.227-21 Technical Data Declaration, Revision, and Withholding of Payment—Major Systems (JAN 1997)

**Response: The date cited for FAR Clause 52.227-21 is hereby changed to DEC 2007.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 303

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Section I – Contract Clauses

**Specific Paragraph:** I.4

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Offeror suggests correcting the effective dates of the following FAR clauses to reflect (Dec 2007) as this is the current version. FAR 52.227-1 AUTHORIZATION AND CONSENT (JUL 1995). FAR 52.227-2 NOTICE AND ASSISTANCE REGARDING PATENT AND COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT (AUG 1996). FAR 52.227-14 RIGHTS IN DATA – GENERAL (JUN 1987) ALTERNATE II JUN 1987. FAR 52.227-16 ADDITIONAL DATA REQUIREMENTS (JUN 1987). FAR 52.227-17 RIGHTS IN DATA-SPECIAL WORKS (JUN 1987). FAR 52.227-18 RIGHTS IN DATA-EXISTING WORKS (JUN 1987).

**Response:** The effective date of the following FAR clauses in Section I is hereby changed to DEC 2007: FAR 52.227-1 AUTHORIZATION AND CONSENT (JUL 1995). FAR 52.227-2 NOTICE AND ASSISTANCE REGARDING PATENT AND COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT (AUG 1996). FAR 52.227-14 RIGHTS IN DATA – GENERAL (JUN 1987) ALTERNATE II JUN 1987. FAR 52.227-16 ADDITIONAL DATA REQUIREMENTS (JUN 1987). FAR 52.227-17 RIGHTS IN DATA-SPECIAL WORKS (JUN 1987). FAR 52.227-18 RIGHTS IN DATA-EXISTING WORKS (JUN 1987).

---

**Tracking ID:** 305

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Section K – Representations and Certifications

**Specific Paragraph:** K.2

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Offeror suggests correcting the effective dates of the following RFP FAR clause to reflect (SEP 2007) as this is the current version. FAR 52.203-11 Certification and Disclosure Regarding Payments to Influence Certain Federal Transactions. (SEP 2005).

**Response:** The effective date for FAR Clause 52.203-11 is hereby changed to SEP 2007.

---

**Tracking ID:** 306

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Section L – Instructions

**Specific Paragraph:**

L.9.1.5.3 and L.9.4.3

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Can subcontractors who do not exceed the \$11.5 Million threshold in the Base Period be excluded from the requirement to separately complete the PEM?

**Response:** Please refer to Amendment No. 5 that removes the PEM from the RFP.

---

**Tracking ID:** 307

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Attachment 1 – SOW

**Specific Paragraph:**

3.1.1.2.12.2.9

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** SOW Paragraph 3.1.1.2.12.2.9 states “...the Contractor shall deliver the populated IPDE, required documentation, associated software, and the necessary rights to that data and software, per the transition plan delineated in the IPDE Management Plan, so that the Government may deploy, operate, modify, and maintain it for the duration of the NAIS life-cycle.” For costing purposes, is it the Coast Guard’s expectation that the IPDE delivery will include all application software and licenses for all internal and external IPDE applications?

**Response:** Yes, the Offeror should include license costs for software/applications not currently owned by the USCG. For example, the USCG has an enterprise license agreement with ESRI through DHS to obtain all ESRI products. As a result, no licensing costs for those products should be included in the offerors estimate.

**Additionally, the following changes to the Statement of Work (SOW), Attachment J.2 are provided:**

**1) SOW Section 3.1.1.1.2.3.9 is modified to read as follows:**

**“Geographic Information System Interface. The IPDE shall be accessible to a Government provided Geographic Information System (GIS) interface that will allow the NAIS GIS to access all of the data in the IPDE for rapid searching, analyses, and roll-up of data, for key metrics that are typically used for internal USCG briefings, status reports, Congressional inquiries, and other uses (see Attachment J.9 for GIS Information). This will require a separate SQL database to be included in the IPDE and populated with data pulled from the documents that reside in the IPDE. The SQL Data Table Structure for the IPDE will be provided to the contractor at award. These roll-ups and queries shall, at a minimum, be able to be organized by: PSS Site; USCG Sector; USCG District; current congressional district; state and territory; entire project area; and Fiscal Year and Quarter.”**

**2) Subparagraph (k) is added to SOW Section 3.1.1.1.2.3.9.1 to read as follows:**

**“k. Equipment installed at each site, down to serial number, summaries of site configuration types, trouble-ticket histories, and other similar searches, queries and roll-ups to support sustainment and configuration management.”**

**3) SOW Section 3.1.1.1.2.3.10 is modified to read as follows:**

**“COTS Products. To the maximum extent possible, the IPDE shall use COTS products (e.g., MS Office SharePoint Server, MS SQL Server 2005 [Enterprise or Professional], and ESRI ArcInfo 9.1 or ArcView 9.1).”**

4) Section 3.1.1.1.2.5 is modified to read as follows:

**“ IPDE Support. The Contractor shall support and maintain the IPDE in a cost-effective manner to support a Government user population of approximately 250 total users with 50 concurrent users at any given time. The IPDE shall be configured and supported such that users can quickly navigate and access assistance when encountering problems during use. This support may consist of help desk support, online interactive help, Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ), and other similar methods. The mix of support formats should consider turnover of IPDE users, estimated at approximately every two years.”**

5) Section 3.1.1.1.2.9 is modified to read as follows:

**“Delivery of the IPDE. At the end of the contract performance period, or within 30 days of being directed by the Contracting Officer, the Contractor shall deliver the populated IPDE, required documentation, associated software, and the necessary rights and licenses to that data and software, per the transition plan delineated in the IPDE Management Plan, so that the Government may deploy, operate, modify, and maintain it for the duration of the NAIS life-cycle in the same manner and with the same functionality available during deployment.”**

**Tracking ID:** 308

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Section L – Instructions

**Specific Paragraph:**

L.8.4.2(b)

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Is the 5% goal the sum of the awards to each of the subcategories (small disadvantaged business, women-owned small business, and service disabled veteran owned small business concerns)?

**Response: Yes. It is how the offeror plans to meet the 5% goal for each subcategories (small disadvantaged business, women-owned small business, and service disabled veteran-owned small business concerns).**

---

**Tracking ID:** 309

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Other

**Specific Paragraph:**

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Volume I, Section 2, Model Contract/Representations and Certifications, requires that completed Section A, Section B, and Section K be submitted as part of offeror's proposal. Is it acceptable for offeror to remove the RFP page headers from these sections when transposing them into our proposal?

**Response: It is recommended that you do not remove the headers.**

---



**Tracking ID:** 310

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Other      **Specific Paragraph:**      **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Volume I, Section 2, Model Contract/Representations and Certifications, requires that completed Section A, Section B, and Section K be submitted as part of offeror's proposal. Is it acceptable for offeror to remove the RFP page headers from these sections when transposing them into our proposal?

**Response:** Please see response provided to Tracking ID Number 309.

---

**Tracking ID:** 311

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Section L – Instructions      **Specific Paragraph:** L.2.5

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Section L.2.5, Earned Value Management System, paragraph I states: "Offerors shall identify the major subcontractors, or major subcontracted effort if major subcontractors have not been selected, planned for application of the guidelines. The prime Contractor and the Government shall agree to subcontractors selected for application of the EVMS guidelines." A) It is our understanding that the major subcontractors that should be selected for the EVMS Certification are those that are greater than 10% of the contract value. Is that correct? B) Is the contract value considered to be the value for the Base Period only? Or, is the contract value considered to be the total bid including all options? C) Volume I, Section 5 of the proposal is the Advance Agreement or EVMS Plan. If the prime has an Advance Agreement for EVM, is an EVMS Plan required for the major subcontractors (those having greater than 10% of the contract value)? D) If an EVMS Plan is required, is it required that the EVMS Certification be complete prior to contract award? Or, can the plan be "in process" at contract award?

**Response:** Yes, if an EVMS Plan is required to describe the Contractor's and/or Major subcontractors' plan to achieve EVMS certification, that certification must be achieved within 60 days after contract award and delivered under CDRL 1.2.10.2.

---

**Tracking ID:** 312

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Section L – Instructions      **Specific Paragraph:**  
L.8.3.1

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** We are the prime contractor, and we have two major subcontractors. May we submit up to 15 relevant contracts in the past performance section of our NAIS proposal?

**Response:** Yes. Please see response provided for Tracking ID Number 28.

---

**Tracking ID:** 314

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/31/2008

**Section:** Section F – Deliveries or Performance

**Specific Paragraph:**

B.1.1.1, B.1.1.2; F.3.1

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Does the government expect the IOC capability to be delivered, deployed and operational within 24 months after contract award (the base period)? This appears to contradict with the delivery of the Core capability 22 months after contract award. The SOW in section 3.1.1.8.2.3.3.7 says that the Core system must pass its DT&E prior to deployment or implementation of the IOC sectors. Current RFP states the delivery of the IOC is 12 months after option exercise. RATIONALE: If delivery of the Core capability is at 22 months after contract award, and the IOC deployment and implementations does not start until after DT&E of the Core, only 2 months would appear to be available to deploy and test the IOC sectors to be delivered within the base period. RECOMMENDATION: Please clarify the relationship between the delivery schedule for the Core and IOC and provide an anticipated IOC Option exercise date so proper scheduling and costing can take place.

**Response:** The Government does expect that the Initial Operational Capability (IOC) will be delivered, deployed, tested and operational within 24 months after contract award (the base period). The Government expects that Sector coverage designs, site selection and site specific designs will commence upon exercise of CLIN 0002, which will precede the completion of the Core Capability implementation. For scheduling and costing purposes, the Offeror may assume that the Government will exercise CLIN 0002 within 12 months after contract award.

---